



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,703	01/02/2004	Arjun Chandrasekar Iyer	SBL0011C1US	3820
66/975 7590 10/30/2008 CAMPBELL STEPHENSON LLP 11401 CENTURY OAKS TERRACE BLDG. H, SUITE 250 AUSTIN, TX 78758				
EXAMINER				
HARPER, LEON JONATHAN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2166				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/30/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/750,703

Applicant(s)

CHANDRASEKAR IYER ET AL.

Examiner

Leon J. Harper

Art Unit

2166

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 116-162 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 116-162 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CIS)
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed 7/21/2008 has been entered. Claims 128-132, 134-137, 155-162 have been amended. No claims have been added or cancelled. accordingly, claims 116-162 are pending in this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 116-163 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,864,842 (hereinafter Pederson).

As for claim 116 Pederson discloses: generating a set of SQL statements to query a first table and a second table (See column 4 lines 25-30), wherein the generating uses a relationship between the first table and the second table to construct the set of SQL statements, and the set of SQL statements comprises SQL statements other than a statement that joins the first and second tables querying the first table using the set of SQL statements to produce a result set (See column 4 lines 35-47); querying the second table using the set of SQL statements to produce a second result

set; and ,joining the result set and the second result set to produce a third result set (See column 4 lines 50-57).

As for claim 117 the rejection of claim 116 is incorporated and further Pederson discloses: a parent/child relationship between the first and second tables, wherein one of the first and second tables is a parent table, and if the first table is the parent table, the second table is a child table, and if the second table is the parent table, the first table is the child table (See figure 4).

As for claim 118 the rejection of claim 117 is incorporated and further Pederson discloses: querying the parent table using the set of SQL statements to produce the result set; and using the result set in constructing a second set of SQL statements to query the child table, wherein the second set of SQL statements comprises SQL statements other than a second statement that joins the second table to another table (See column 7 lines 15-25).

As for claim 119 the rejection of claim 118 is incorporated and further Pederson discloses: querying the child table using the second set of SQL statements to produce the second result set (See column 6 lines 40-50).

As for claim 120 the rejection of claim 119 is incorporated and further Pederson discloses returning the third result set as a result of the query of the first and second tables (See column 6 lines 40-50):.

As for claim 121 the rejection of claim 118 is incorporated and further Pederson discloses: the second set of SQL statements comprises: a query statement for selecting a record having a value of a foreign key field of the second table equal to a value of a target key field in the result set (See column 6 lines 30-45).

As for claim 122 the rejection of claim 116 is incorporated and further Pederson discloses: using the result set in constructing a second set of SQL statements to query the second table, wherein the second set of SQL statements comprises SQL statements other than a second statement that joins the second table to another table (See column 6 lines 35-50)

As for claim 123 the rejection of claim 122 is incorporated and further Pederson discloses: querying the second table using the second set of SQL statements to produce the second result set (See column 6 lines 40-50),

As for claim 124 the rejection of claim 123 is incorporated and further Pederson discloses: returning the third result set as a result of the query of the first and second tables 9See column 6 lines 35-55).

As for claim 125 the rejection of claim 122 is incorporated and further Pederson discloses: a query statement for selecting a record having a value of a foreign key field of the second table equal to a value of a target key field in the result set (See column 7 lines 5-15).

As for claim 126 the rejection of claim 116 is incorporated and further Pederson discloses: obtaining a search specification for the query of the first and second tables, wherein the set of SQL statements comprises a query statement to select a record from at least one of the first and second tables if the record satisfies the search specification (See column 6 lines 40-45).

As for claim 127 the rejection of claim 126 is incorporated and further Pederson discloses: executing the set of SQL statements to produce the third result set; and returning the third result set in response to the search specification (See column 6 lines 35-55).

Claims 128 -163 are all either system or computer program product claims all comprising substantially the same limitations as claims 116-127 and are thus rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection of claims 116-127.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/21/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues:

In fact, one limitation that remains unaddressed reads: the set of SQL statements comprises SQL statements other than a statement that joins the first and second tables; ... "(Emphasis supplied) Pederson, in the cited portions or elsewhere, insofar as Applicants are able to discern, provides no teaching as to the implementation, use or benefits of a joinless query. No technology even comparable to a joinless query, is shown, taught or even suggested by Pederson. As is demonstrated in the claims and the Specification, the claimed set of SQL statements comprises SQL statements other than a statement that joins the first and second tables. No such concepts can be found in Pederson. In fact, the splitting of an SQL query into steps can be interpreted as teaching away from the use of a joinless query (the splitting of an SQL query into multiple steps (Step 24) being the antithesis of accomplishing the query in a one (or at least fewer) step(s)). At best, the query is performed iteratively, with each query resulting in a set of results that must then be merged to provide the desired results ("Block 28 represents the IFP node 12 then merging the responses that come from the AMP nodes 12." (Pederson, col. 4, 11. 53-54; Step 28 of Fig. 2). Thus, without the need to reach any other of Pederson's infirmities, Pederson's failure to show, teach or suggest a joinless SQL query that is performed by generating a set of SQL statements

to query a first table and a second table, wherein the act of generating uses a relationship between the first table and the second table to construct the set of SQL statements, rather than an SQL statement that joins the first and second tables, proves to be a fatal flaw.

Examiner responds:

Examiner is not persuaded .Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification. Interpretation of Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation: During patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.' Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969). In this case the only requirement is that the Set of SQL states does not explicitly join the first and second table. The result set can and in fact are joined together later in the claim, so the claim cannot read that no joining takes place, In the case of the Pederson reference the tables are broken u and data accessing and comparison still occurs (See column 4 lines 35-45).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leon J. Harper whose telephone number is 571-272-0759. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM - 4:00Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LJH
Leon J. Harper
October 26, 2008

/Hosain T Alam/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2166